arXiv:1208.3792v1 [math.OA] 18 Aug 2012

DISTANCE k-GRAPHS OF HYPERCUBE AND q-HERMITE POLYNOMIALS

HUN HEE LEE AND NOBUAKI OBATA

Abstract. We will prove that some weighted graphs on the distance k-graph of hypercubes approximate the q-Hermite polynomial of a q-gaussian variable by providing an appropriate matrix model.

1. Introduction

During the last decade quantum probabilistic approach to the study of asymptotic spectral analysis of graphs has been developed considerably, and many important probability distributions are obtained as scaled limits of spectral distributions of growing graphs, see [7] and references cited therein. For example, the spectral distribution of the Hamming graph $H(d,n)$ converges to the standard normal distribution or the Poisson distribution by taking a suitable scaling limit as $d,n \to \infty$, which was first proved by means of quantum probabilistic method in [6].

In this paper we extend quantum probabilistic method to weighted graphs and derive the distribution of the q-gaussian variable G_q $(-1 \le q \le 1)$ by Bożejko and Speicher [4]. In fact, we will show that the probability distribution of $H^q_k(G_q)$, where H^q_k is the k-th q-Hermite polynomial, is derived from a sequence of weighted graphs on the distance k-graph of n-cube. It is noteworthy that q-gaussian variables for $q \neq 0, 1$ have not been so far observed in line with the asymptotic spectral analysis [7], where consideration has been mostly restricted to simple graphs, i.e., undirected graphs with no loops and no weights (multi-edges). While, our result in a particular case of $q = 1$ is proved in [9] in an alternative manner.

This paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we will recall some basic notations and tools we need for the proof of the result, which includes the baby Fock model for q-gaussians. In section 3 we will explain the connection between the distance k-graph of hypercubes and the baby Fock model, and finally we will prove the main result in section 4. For basic concepts of quantum (non-commutative) probability, see e.g., [7, 8].

2. Preliminaries

2.1. **Non-commutative probability and convergence of distributions.** Let $(\mathcal{M}_n, \varphi_n)_{n\ge 1}$ and $(\mathcal{M}, \varphi)$ be non-commutative (tracial) W^*-probability spaces. For $m \ge 1$ we consider self-adjoint elements $X^n_1, \cdots, X^n_m \in \mathcal{M}_n$ and $X_1, \cdots, X_m \in \mathcal{M}$. We say that the sequence of n-tuples $(X^n_1, \cdots, X^n_m)$ *converges to* $(X_1, \cdots, X_m)$ *in distribution* as $n \to \infty$ if

$$\varphi_n(P(X^n_1, \cdots, X^n_m)) \to \varphi(P(X_1, \cdots, X_m))$$

for any polynomial P of m non-commuting variables. We will use the notation

$$(X^n_1, \cdots, X^n_m) \xrightarrow{\text{dist}} (X_1, \cdots, X_m).$$

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 46L53, 05C50.

Key words and phrases. graph spectrum, hypercube, distance k-graph, q-Hermite polynomials.

Remark 2.1. In classical probability theory, we say that a sequence of random variables X_n converges to X in distribution if the probability distribution of X_n converges weakly to that of X. Therefore the above notion of convergence in distribution for non-commuting random variables is not compatible to the one in classical probability theory. We say often that a sequence of random variables X_n converges to X in moments if the m-th moment of X_n converges to that of X for all m. It is known that the convergence in moments implies the convergence in distribution if the distribution of X allows a positive answer to the determinate moment problem. For more information along this line, see e.g., [5, Chapter 4].

We present a lemma, which is probably a folklore in non-commutative probability. We include the proof for the convenience of the readers. Recall that the non-commutative L^p-space $L^p(\mathcal{M},\varphi)$ is the completion of $(\mathcal{M}, \|\cdot\|_p)$, where the p-norm on $\mathcal{M}$, $\|\cdot\|_p$ is defined by

$$\|x\|_p = (\varphi(|x|^p))^{\frac{1}{p}}, \ \ x \in \mathcal{M}.$$

Lemma 2.2. *Let $X^n_1, \cdots, X^n_m \in \mathcal{M}_n$ and $X_1, \cdots, X_m \in \mathcal{M}$ be self-adjoint elements and assume that*

$$(X^n_1, \cdots, X^n_m) \overset{\text{dist}}{\longrightarrow} (X_1, \cdots, X_m).$$

Let $Y^n_1, \cdots, Y^n_m \in \mathcal{M}_n$ be self-adjoint elements satisfying

1. *$\{\|X^n_i\|_p, \|Y^n_i\|_p : n \geq 1, 1 \leq i \leq m\}$ are bounded for all $p \geq 1$ with bounds depending only on p.*
2. *$\|X^n_i - Y^n_i\|_p \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ for all $p \geq 1$.*

Then, we also have

$$(Y^n_1, \cdots, Y^n_m) \overset{\text{dist}}{\longrightarrow} (X_1, \cdots, X_m).$$

Proof. It is enough to prove the case of monomials. Let us fix a monomial P. Our strategy is the following. We begin with $\lim_{n\to\infty} \varphi_n(P(X^n_1, \cdots, X^n_m))$ and exchange each X^n_1 with Y^n_1 one by one. Here we use the Hölder inequality and the conditions (1) and (2). Then we replace X^n_2 by Y^n_2 similarly, and we repeat the same procedure until we replace all X^n_i's by Y^n_i's.

Let us do the case of $\varphi((X^n_1)^2(X^n_2)^3)$ as an example. Then, by the Hölder inequality we have

$$\left|\varphi((X^n_1 - Y^n_1)X^n_1(X^n_2)^3)\right| \leq \|X^n_1 - Y^n_1\|_5 \|X^n_1\|_5 \|X^n_2\|^3_5,$$

so that the conditions (1) and (2) allow us to conclude that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \varphi((X^n_1)^2(X^n_2)^3) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \varphi(Y^n_1 X^n_1 (X^n_2)^3).$$

Note that the number 5 in $\|\cdot\|_5$ is the degree of the monomial.

□

2.2. **The q-gaussians.**

In this subsection we recall the q-gaussian variables. Let $H_{\mathbb{R}}$ be a real Hilbert space and $\mathcal{H} = H_{\mathbb{R}} + iH_{\mathbb{R}}$ be its complexification. We consider the operator of symmetrization P_n on $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$ defined by

$$P_0\Omega = \Omega, \ \ P_n(f_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes f_n) = \sum_{\pi \in S_n} q^{i(\pi)} f_{\pi(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes f_{\pi(n)},$$

where S_n denotes the symmetric group of permutations of n elements and

$$i(\pi) = \#\{(i,j) | 1 \leq i,j \leq n, \pi(i) > \pi(j)\}$$

is the number of inversions of $\pi \in S_n$.

Now we define the *q-inner product* $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_q$ on $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$ by

$$\langle \xi, \eta \rangle_q = \langle \xi, P_n \eta \rangle \ \text{ for } \xi, \eta \in \mathcal{H}^{\otimes n},$$

where $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ is the inner product in $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$. When $-1<q<1$ P_n's are strictly positive ([4]), so that $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_q$ is actually an inner product. We denote by $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes_q n}$ the resulting Hilbert space. Then one can associate the q-Fock space $\mathcal{F}_q(\mathcal{H})$.

$$\mathcal{F}_q(\mathcal{H})=\mathbb{C}\Omega\oplus\bigoplus_{n\geq 1}\mathcal{H}^{\otimes_q n},$$

where Ω is a unit vector called vacuum. When $q=0$ we recover the so-called full Fock space over $\mathcal{H}$. In the extreme cases $q=\pm 1$, we have

$$\mathcal{F}_1(\mathcal{H})=\mathbb{C}\Omega\oplus\bigoplus_{n\geq 1}\mathcal{H}^{\otimes_s n},\qquad \mathcal{F}_{-1}(\mathcal{H})=\mathbb{C}\Omega\oplus\bigoplus_{n\geq 1}\mathcal{H}^{\otimes_a n},$$

which are referred to as the Bosonic and Fermionic Fock spaces, respectively. Here $\otimes_s$ and $\otimes_a$ refer to symmetric and anti-symmetric tensor product of Hilbert spaces, respectively.

For $h\in H_{\mathbb{R}}$, we can define a generalized q-semi-circular random variable on $\mathcal{F}_q(\mathcal{H})$ $(-1<q<1)$ by

$$s(h)=\ell_q(h)+\ell_q^*(h),$$

where $\ell_q(h)$ is the left creation operator by $h\in\mathcal{H}$ and $\ell_q^*(h)$ is the adjoint of $\ell_q(h)$. Recall that $\ell_q(h)$ is given by

$$\ell_q(h)\Omega=h,\ \ \ell_q(h)f_1\otimes\cdots\otimes f_n=h\otimes f_1\otimes\cdots\otimes f_n.$$

Note that in the extreme cases $q=\pm 1$ the creation operators have slightly different forms due to the symmetrization procedure. For example, we have

$$\ell_1(h)\Omega=h,\ \ \ell_1(h)f^{\otimes n}=\frac{1}{n+1}\sum_{k=0}^{n}f^{\otimes n-k}\otimes h\otimes f^{\otimes k}.$$

Then, we get a W^*-probability space (Γ_q,φ_q), where Γ_q is the von Neumann algebra generated by $\{s(h):h\in H_{\mathbb{R}}\}$ in $B(\mathcal{F}_q(\mathcal{H}))$ and $\varphi_q(\cdot)=\langle\cdot\,\Omega,\Omega\rangle$ is the vacuum state.

2.3. **Baby Fock space, central limit procedure and hypercontractivity.** In this section we collect background materials focusing on baby Fock space and its central limit procedure due to Biane [2].

Let $I=\{1,2,\cdots,n\}$ be a fixed index set and $\varepsilon:I\times I\to\{\pm 1\}$ be a "choice of sign" function satisfying

$$\varepsilon(i,j)=\varepsilon(j,i),\ \varepsilon(i,i)=-1,\ \forall i,j\in I.$$

Now we consider the unital algebra $\mathcal{A}(I,\varepsilon)$ with generators $(x_i)_{i\in I}$ satisfying

$$x_ix_j-\varepsilon(i,j)x_jx_i=2\delta_{i,j},\ \ i,j\in I.$$

In particular, we have $x_i^2=1$, $i\in I$, where 1 refers to the unit of the algebra. The involution on $\mathcal{A}(I,\varepsilon)$ is defined by $x_i^*=x_i$. We will use the following notations for the elements in $\mathcal{A}(I,\varepsilon)$.

$$x_\emptyset:=1\ \text{ and }\ x_A:=x_{i_1}\cdots x_{i_k},\ A=\{i_1<\cdots<i_k\}\subseteq I.$$

Then, $\{x_A:A\subseteq I\}$ is a basis for $A(\mathcal{I},\varepsilon)$. Let $\phi^\varepsilon:\mathcal{A}(I,\varepsilon)\to\mathbb{C}$ be the tracial state given by

$$\phi^\varepsilon(x_A)=\delta_{A,\emptyset},$$

which gives rise to a natural inner product on $\mathcal{A}(I,\varepsilon)$ as follows:

$$\langle x,y\rangle:=\phi^\varepsilon(y^*x),\ \ x,y\in\mathcal{A}(I,\varepsilon).$$

Let

$$H=L^2(\mathcal{A}(I,\varepsilon),\phi^\varepsilon)$$

be the corresponding L^2-space, then clearly $\{x_A:A\subseteq I\}$ is an orthonormal basis for H.

Now we consider left creations β_i^* and left annihilations β_i in $B(H)$, $i \in I$ in this context.

$$\beta_i^*(x_A) = \begin{cases} x_i x_A & \text{if } i \notin A \\ 0 & \text{if } i \in A \end{cases}, \quad \beta_i(x_A) = \begin{cases} x_i x_A & \text{if } i \in A \\ 0 & \text{if } i \notin A \end{cases}, \quad i \in I,\ A \subseteq I.$$

The baby gaussians are defined as follows.

$$\gamma_i := \beta_i^* + \beta_i, \ \ 1 \le i \le n.$$

It is straightforward to check that γ_i is the same as left multiplication operator with respect to x_i, so that we often identify γ_i and x_i. Let Γ_n be the von Neumann algebra generated by $\{\gamma_i\}_{i=1}^n$ in $B(H)$. It is also known that 1 is a cyclic and separating vector for Γ_n, and the above is the faithful GNS representation of $(\Gamma_n, \tau_n^\varepsilon)$, where τ_n^ε is the vacuum state on Γ_n given by

$$\tau_n^\varepsilon(\cdot) = \langle \cdot 1, 1\rangle.$$

Note that τ_n^ε is tracial on Γ_n.

Now we replace $\{\varepsilon(i,j) : 1 \le i < j \le n\}$ with a family of i.i.d. random variables with

$$P(\varepsilon(i,j) = -1) = \frac{1-q}{2}, \ \ P(\varepsilon(i,j) = 1) = \frac{1+q}{2}.$$

We set

$$s_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i.$$

Then, the Speicher's central limit procedure ([10] or [2]) tells us the following.

Proposition 2.3. *We have*

$$s_n \xrightarrow{\text{dist}} G_q$$

for almost every ε. In other words, we have for any polynomial Q

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \tau_n^\varepsilon(Q(s_n)) = \tau_q(Q(G_q))$$

for almost every ε.

We close this section with the last ingredient for the proof, namely hypercontractivity of baby Ornstein-Uhlenbeck semigroup. Recall that the number operator N_ε on H is given by $N_\varepsilon = \sum_{i\in I} \beta_i^* \beta_i$. Then, for any $A \subseteq I$ we have $N_\varepsilon x_A = |A|\, x_A$. Since $1 \in H$ is separating and cyclic for Γ_n we define the ε-Ornstein-Uhlenbeck semigroup $P_t^\varepsilon : \Gamma_n \to \Gamma_n$ by

$$P_t^\varepsilon(X)1 = e^{-tN_\varepsilon}(X1), \ \ X \in \Gamma_n. \tag{2.1}$$

Theorem 2.4. *Let $1 < p < r < \infty$ we have*

$$\|P_t^\varepsilon\|_{L^p \to L^r} \le 1 \ \textit{ if and only if } \ e^{-2t} \le \frac{p-1}{r-1}.$$

The above result is due to Biane [2, Theorem 5], which leads us to a Khinchine type inequality as follows.

Corollary 2.5. *Let $X = \displaystyle\sum_{i_1,\cdots,i_k=1}^n \alpha_{i_1\cdots i_k} \gamma_{i_1} \cdots \gamma_{i_k} \in \Gamma_n$, then we have*

$$\|X\|_2 \le \|X\|_p \le (p-1)^{\frac{k}{2}} \|X\|_2 .$$

Proof. Note that $P_t^\varepsilon(X) = e^{-kt}X$. Then it is a direct application of Theorem 2.4. □

3. THE DISTANCE k-GRAPH OF HYPERCUBES AND BABY FOCK MODEL

We begin this section by recalling some graph theoretic notions. A *weighted graph* consists of the set of vertices V, the of edges $E \subset V \times V$ and a collections of weights $A = (a_{xy})_{(x,y)\in E}$, $a_{xy} \in \mathbb{R}$. We say that (V, E, A) is a weighted graph on the unweighted graph (V, E) (i.e. every weight is identically 1). The matrix A is called the *adjacency matrix* of the weighted graph. When the graph is finite (i.e. finite number of vertices) A is a non-commutative random variable in a W^*-probability space $(M_{|V|}, \varphi_e)$, where $M_{|V|}$ is the matrix algebra of the size $|V|$ and $\varphi_e(B) = \langle B\delta_e, \delta_e\rangle = B_{ee}$ for a fixed point $e \in V$ and $B \in M_{|V|}$.

The n-cube is the unweighted graph $K_2^n = K_2 \times \cdots \times K_2$, the n-fold direct product of the complete graph K_2 with two vertices. Then there is a bijection between the vertices of K_2^n and the set of pre-described orthonormal basis of H as follows.

$$(r_1, \cdots, r_n) \mapsto x_1^{r_1} \cdots x_n^{r_n},$$

where $r_i \in \{0, 1\}$ and $x_i^0 = 1$. Note that $x_1^{r_1} \cdots x_n^{r_n} = x_A$ with $A = \{1 \le i \le n : r_i = 1\}$.

In n-cube there is an edge between two vertices $(r_1, \cdots, r_n)$ and $(s_1, \cdots, s_n)$ if and only if there is only one index i such that $r_i \neq s_i$. *The distance k-graph of K_2^n* $(1 \le k \le n)$ is the graph with the same set of vertices but with the set of edges described as follows.

$$\{((r_1, \cdots, r_n), (s_1, \cdots, s_n)) : \text{there are exactly } k \text{ indices } 1 \le i \le n \text{ with } r_i \neq s_i\}.$$

Now we focus on the the *Bosonic* case for the moment, which implies that $q = 1$ and so that the choice of sign function ε is identically 1. Then, it is straightforward to see that the operator

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \gamma_i$$

represents the adjacency matrix of K_2^n since γ_i is nothing but multiplying x_i. It is again straightforward to see that the operator

$$\frac{1}{k!} \sum_{\substack{i_1,\cdots,i_k \\ \neq}} \gamma_{i_1} \cdots \gamma_{i_k} = \sum_{i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_k} \gamma_{i_1}\gamma_{i_2} \cdots \gamma_{i_k}$$

represents the adjacency matrix of the distance k-graph of K_2^n. Here the summation in the left-hand side is taken over distinct $i_1, \cdots, i_k$ taken from $\{1, \cdots, n\}$.

Now let us turn our attention to the case of general ε. This time γ_i still acts on $x_1^{r_1} \cdots x_n^{r_n}$ by multiplying x_i on the left, but we need to take the commutation relations into account. Thus, the operator

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \gamma_i$$

corresponds to the adjacency matrix of the *weighted graph on K_2^n* described as follows: We put the weight

$$\varepsilon(\mathbf{r}, i) = \varepsilon(i, 1)^{r_1} \cdots \varepsilon(i, i-1)^{r_{i-1}}$$

on the edge between $\mathbf{r} = (r_1, \cdots, r_n)$ and $\mathbf{s} = (s_1, \cdots, s_n)$ with $s_i \neq r_i$, but $s_j = r_j$, $\forall j \neq i$. Similarly, the operator

$$\frac{1}{k!} \sum_{\substack{i_1,\cdots,i_k \\ \neq}} \gamma_{i_1} \cdots \gamma_{i_k}$$

represents the adjacency matrix of a *weighted graph on the distance k-graph of K_2^n*. The rule for assigning weights on each edge is the following. If there is an edge between $\mathbf{r} = (r_1, \cdots, r_n)$ and $\mathbf{s} = (s_1, \cdots, s_n)$, then we have k distinct indices

$\{j_1 < \cdots < j_k\}$ with $s_{j_l} \neq r_{j_l}$, $1 \leq l \leq k$ but $s_j = r_j$, $\forall j \notin \{j_1, \cdots, j_k\}$. For a permutation $\sigma \in S_k$ and $\mathbf{j} = (j_1, \cdots, j_k)$ we define $\epsilon(\sigma, \mathbf{j})$ to be the number given by

$$\gamma_{j_{\sigma(1)}} \cdots \gamma_{j_{\sigma(k)}} = \epsilon(\sigma, \mathbf{j}) \gamma_{j_1} \cdots \gamma_{j_k}.$$

On the above edge we put the weight

$$\frac{1}{k!} \sum_{\sigma \in S_k} \epsilon(\sigma, \mathbf{j}) \cdot \prod_{l=1}^{k} \varepsilon(\mathbf{r}, j_l).$$

4. WEIGHTED GRAPHS ON HYPERCUBES AND q-HERMITE POLYNOMIALS

In this section we focus on the analytic part of our results, namely the convergence analysis.

We recall the normalized q-Hermite polynomial H_k^q given by the following recurrence relations.

$$\begin{cases} H_0^q(x) = 1, \ H_1^q(x) = x \\ xH_k^q(x) = H_{k+1}^q(x) + [k]_q H_{k-1}^q(x), \quad k \geq 1, \end{cases}$$

where $[k]_q = \frac{1-q^k}{1-q}$.

We are interested in the following operator.

$$X_{n,k} := \frac{1}{n^{\frac{k}{2}}} \sum_{\substack{i_1, \cdots, i_k \\ \neq}} \gamma_{i_1} \cdots \gamma_{i_k}.$$

We would like to find a recurrence relation regarding $X_{n,k}$ by multiplying $X_{n,1}$. Now we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(\sum_{\substack{i_1, \cdots, i_k \\ \neq}} \gamma_{i_1} \cdots \gamma_{i_k} \right) \left(\sum_{i} \gamma_i \right) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{i_1, \cdots, i_k, i \\ \neq}} \gamma_{i_1} \cdots \gamma_{i_k} \gamma_i + \sum_{\substack{i = i_1, \cdots, i_k \\ \neq}} \gamma_{i_1} \cdots \gamma_{i_k} \gamma_i + \cdots + \sum_{\substack{i_1, \cdots, i_k = i \\ \neq}} \gamma_{i_1} \cdots \gamma_{i_k} \gamma_i. \end{aligned}$$

By relabeling we denote $\sum_{\substack{i_1, \cdots, i_k, i \\ \neq}} \gamma_{i_1} \cdots \gamma_{i_k} \gamma_i = \sum_{\substack{i_1, \cdots, i_k, i_{k+1} \\ \neq}} \gamma_{i_1} \cdots \gamma_{i_{k+1}}$. For the second term we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{i = i_1, \cdots, i_k \\ \neq}} \gamma_{i_1} \cdots \gamma_{i_k} \gamma_i &= \sum_{\substack{i, i_2, \cdots, i_k \\ \neq}} \varepsilon_{i, i_2} \cdots \varepsilon_{i, i_k} \gamma_{i_2} \cdots \gamma_{i_k} \\ &= \sum_{\substack{i, i_1, \cdots, i_{k-1} \\ \neq}} \varepsilon_{i, i_1} \cdots \varepsilon_{i, i_{k-1}} \gamma_{i_1} \cdots \gamma_{i_{k-1}} \end{aligned}$$

by relabeling again. If we repeat the similar relabeling, then we get

$$\tag{4.1}
\begin{aligned}
&\left(\sum_{\substack{i_1,\cdots,i_k\\ \neq}} \gamma_{i_1}\cdots\gamma_{i_k}\right)\left(\sum_i \gamma_i\right)\\
&= \sum_{\substack{i_1,\cdots,i_{k+1}\\ \neq}} \gamma_{i_1}\cdots\gamma_{i_{k+1}}\\
&\quad + \sum_{\substack{i_1,\cdots,i_{k-1}\\ \neq}} \sum_{i\notin(i_1,\cdots,i_{k-1})} (\varepsilon_{i,i_1}\cdots\varepsilon_{i,i_{k-1}} + \varepsilon_{i,i_2}\cdots\varepsilon_{i,i_{k-1}} + \cdots + 1)\gamma_{i_1}\cdots\gamma_{i_{k-1}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now we define

$$Y_{n,k} := \frac{1}{n^{\frac{k}{2}}} \sum_{\substack{i_1,\cdots,i_k\\ \neq}} [k+1]_q^{-1} Z(i_1,\cdots,i_k)\gamma_{i_1}\cdots\gamma_{i_k},$$

where

$$Z(i_1,\cdots,i_k) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i\notin(i_1,\cdots,i_k)} (\varepsilon_{i,i_1}\cdots\varepsilon_{i,i_k} + \varepsilon_{i,i_2}\cdots\varepsilon_{i,i_k} + \cdots + 1).$$

Here comes the key recurrence relation obtained by dividing (4.1) with $n^{\frac{k+1}{2}}$.

$$\tag{4.2} X_{n,k+1} = X_{n,k}X_{n,1} - [k]_q Y_{n,k-1}, \quad k \geq 1.$$

We will use Lemma 2.2 for the sequences $(X_{n,1},\cdots,X_{n,k},Y_{n,1},\cdots,Y_{n,k-1})$ and $(X_{n,1},\cdots,X_{n,k},X_{n,1},\cdots,X_{n,k-1})$. In order to do so we need to check the conditions (1) and (2) in this case.

The condition (1) can be easily checked by Corollary 2.5. Note that

$$\{\gamma_{i_1}\cdots\gamma_{i_k} : \text{all distinct } \ i_1,\cdots,i_k\}$$

is an orthonormal family in $L^2(\Gamma_n)$ and the number of indices $(i_j)_{j=1}^k$ with all distinct entries is strictly smaller than $n^{\frac{k}{2}}$.

The condition (2) is more involved. We first need to understand the limit behavior of $Z(i_1,\cdots,i_k)$ as $n\to\infty$. Note that the sequence of random variables

$$\{W_i = \varepsilon_{i,i_1}\cdots\varepsilon_{i,i_k} + \varepsilon_{i,i_2}\cdots\varepsilon_{i,i_k} + \cdots + 1 : i\notin(i_1,\cdots,i_{k-1})\}$$

is an independent collection. Indeed for $i\neq i'$ both of them are not in $(i_1,\cdots,i_{k-1})$, we have $(i,i_j)\neq(i',i_{j'})$ and $(i,i_j)\neq(i_{j'},i')$ for any $1\leq j,j'\leq k$. Moreover, each random variable has mean

$$\mathbb{E}(W_i) = q^k + q^{k-1} + \cdots + 1 = [k+1]_q$$

and variance

$$\sigma^2 = \mathbb{E}(W_i^2) - \mathbb{E}(W_i)^2 = k+1 + \sum_{j=1}^k 2(k+1-j)q^k - [k+1]_q^2.$$

Thus, the classical central limit theorem tells us that

$$\sqrt{n}([k+1]_q^{-1}Z(i_1,\cdots,i_k) - 1) \xrightarrow{\text{dist}} \mathcal{N}(0,\sigma^2)$$

in our sense (i.e. convergence in moments, see [3, section 30] or [1]), so that their L^p-norms also converge. Thus, we have

$$\left\|\sqrt{n}([k+1]_q^{-1}Z(i_1,\cdots,i_k) - 1)\right\|_p \to \left\|\mathcal{N}(0,\sigma^2)\right\|_p = \alpha_p,$$

and consequently

$$\left\| [k+1]_q^{-1} Z(i_1, \cdots, i_k) - 1 \right\|_p \le \frac{\alpha_p + 1}{\sqrt{n}} \tag{4.3}$$

for big enough n. Note that α_p is a constant depending only on k, q and p, so that it is independent of n.

Now we get the estimate

$$\|X_{n,k} - Y_{n,k}\|_p \le \frac{C_p}{\sqrt{n}} \tag{4.4}$$

for big enough n. Indeed, we have

$$X_{n,k} - Y_{n,k} = \frac{1}{n^{\frac{k}{2}}} \sum_{\substack{i_1, \cdots, i_k \\ \neq}} (1 - [k+1]_q^{-1} Z(i_1, \cdots, i_k)) \gamma_{i_1} \cdots \gamma_{i_k}$$

and by Corollary 2.5, Minkowski's inequality and (4.3) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|X_{n,k} - Y_{n,k}\|_p &= \left[\mathbb{E}\left(\left\|X^\varepsilon_{n,k} - Y^\varepsilon_{n,k}\right\|_p\right)\right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\le \frac{(p-1)^{\frac{k}{2}}}{n^{\frac{k}{2}}} \left[\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{\substack{i_1, \cdots, i_k \\ \neq}} \left|[k+1]_q^{-1} Z(i_1, \cdots, i_k) - 1\right|^2\right)^{\frac{p}{2}}\right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\le \frac{(p-1)^{\frac{k}{2}}}{n^{\frac{k}{2}}} \left(\sum_{\substack{i_1, \cdots, i_k \\ \neq}} \left\|[k+1]_q^{-1} Z(i_1, \cdots, i_k) - 1\right\|_p^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\le \frac{(p-1)^{\frac{k}{2}}(\alpha_p + 1)}{\sqrt{n}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $X^\varepsilon_{n,k}$ is the value of $X_{n,k}$ for a fixed choice of ε. A standard application of Borel-Cantelli lemma with (4.4) leads us to the following conclusion.

$$\left\|X^\varepsilon_{n,k} - Y^\varepsilon_{n,k}\right\|_p \to 0$$

for almost every ε. This observation tells us, together with Proposition 2.3, that we can choose a specific "choice of sign" ε satsfying

$$\begin{cases} X^\varepsilon_{n,1} \xrightarrow{\text{dist}} G_q \\ \left\|X^\varepsilon_{n,k} - Y^\varepsilon_{n,k}\right\|_p \to 0, \ \forall p \ge 1 \end{cases}.$$

Note that we used the fact that the collection of all monomials in non-commuting variables is countable. From now on we will fix this choice of ε and by abuse of notation we will denote $X^\varepsilon_{n,k}$ and $Y^\varepsilon_{n,k}$ simply by $X_{n,k}$ and $Y_{n,k}$, respectively. This explains how we get the condition (2).

Finally, we present the main convergence result.

Theorem 4.1. *We have*

$$\begin{aligned} &(X_{n,1}, \cdots, X_{n,k}, Y_{n,1}, \cdots, Y_{n,k-1}) \\ &\xrightarrow{dist} (H^q_1(G_q), \cdots, H^q_k(G_q), H^q_1(G_q), \cdots, H^q_{k-1}(G_q)). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We will use induction on k. When $k = 1$ we get the result directly from Proposition 2.3. When $k = 2$ we note that

$$X_{n,2} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \neq j} \gamma_i \gamma_j = \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_i \gamma_i\right)^2 - I = X^2_{n,1} - I = H^q_2(X_{n,1}).$$

Thus, we clearly have

$$(X_{n,1}, X_{n,2}, X_{n,1}) \xrightarrow{\text{dist}} (H_1^q(G_q), H_2^q(G_q), H_1^q(G_q)).$$

If we compare two sequences $(X_{n,1}, X_{n,2}, X_{n,1})$ and $(X_{n,1}, X_{n,2}, Y_{n,1})$, then we get the result we wanted by Lemma 2.2 since we already checked the conditions (1) and (2) are satisfied.

Now we suppose the the conclusion is true upto k and let us check the case for $k+1$. Recall the recurrence relation

$$X_{n,k+1} = X_{n,k}X_{n,1} - [k]_q Y_{n,k-1},$$

so that we get

$$\begin{aligned} &(X_{n,1}, \cdots, X_{n,k}, X_{n,k+1}, Y_{n,1}, \cdots, Y_{n,k-1}) \\ &\xrightarrow{\text{dist}} (H_1^q(G_q), \cdots, H_k^q(G_q), H_{k+1}^q(G_q), H_1^q(G_q), \cdots, H_{k-1}^q(G_q)). \end{aligned}$$

This can be trivially extended to the following convergence.

$$\begin{aligned} &(X_{n,1}, \cdots, X_{n,k}, X_{n,k+1}, Y_{n,1}, \cdots, Y_{n,k-1}, X_{n,k}) \\ &\xrightarrow{\text{dist}} (H_1^q(G_q), \cdots, H_k^q(G_q), H_{k+1}^q(G_q), H_1^q(G_q), \cdots, H_{k-1}^q(G_q), H_k^q(G_q)). \end{aligned}$$

If we compare two sequences $(X_{n,1}, \cdots, X_{n,k}, X_{n,k+1}, Y_{n,1}, \cdots, Y_{n,k-1}, X_{n,k})$ and $(X_{n,1}, \cdots, X_{n,k}, X_{n,k+1}, Y_{n,1}, \cdots, Y_{n,k-1}, Y_{n,k})$, then we get the result we wanted by Lemma 2.2 since we already checked the conditions (1) and (2) are satisfied. This finishes the induction process.

□

Corollary 4.2. *For any $k \geq 1$ we have*

$$X_{n,k} \xrightarrow{\text{dist}} H_k^q(G_q).$$

Thus, we can conclude that $H_k^q(G_q)$ can be approximated (in distribution) by a sequence of weighted graphs on the distance k-graph of K_2^n.

Remark 4.3.
1. When $q = 1$ we recover the result of N. Obata in [9].
2. The above result provides a matrix model for $H_k^q(G_q)$ which is homogeneous in degree.

REFERENCES

1. B. Bahr, On the convergence of moments in the central limit theorem. Ann. Math. Statist. **36** (1965) 808-818.
2. P. Biane, Free hypercontractivity. Comm. Math. Phys. **184** (1997), no. 2, 457-474.
3. P. Billingsley, Probability and measure. Third edition. Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics. A Wiley-Interscience Publication. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1995.
4. M. Bożejko and R. Speicher, An example of a generalized Brownian motion. Comm. Math. Phys. **137** (1991), no. 3, 519-531.
5. K. L. Chung, "A Course in Probability Theory," 3rd Edition, Academic Press, San Diego, 2001.
6. Y. Hashimoto, N. Obata and N. Tabei, A quantum aspect of asymptotic spectral analysis of large Hamming graphs, in "Quantum Information III (T. Hida and K. Saitô, Eds.)," pp. 45-57, World Scientific, 2001.
7. A. Hora and N. Obata, "Quantum Probability and Spectral Analysis of Graphs," Springer, Berlin, 2007. xviii+371 pp.
8. A. Nica and R. Speicher, "Lectures on the Combinatorics of Free Probability," London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, 335. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006. xvi+417 pp.
9. N. Obata: Asymptotic spectral distributions of distance k-graphs of large-dimensional hypercubes, to appear in Banach Center Publications, 2012.
10. R. Speicher, A noncommutative central limit theorem. Math. Z. **209** (1992), no. 1, 55-66.

Hun Hee Lee : Department of Mathematics, Chungbuk National University, 410 Sungbong-Ro, Heungduk-Gu, Cheongju 361-763, Korea
E-mail address: `hhlee@chungbuk.ac.kr`

Nobuaki Obata: Graduate School of Information Sciences, Tohoku University, Sendai, 980-8579, Japan
E-mail address: `obata@math.is.tohoku.ac.jp`